

National Republican.

A. M. CLAPP, EDITOR.

The National Republican.

Published daily (except Sundays) by the
Republican Printing & Publishing Company,
at the southeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and
Thirteenth street, at the corner of 10
cents per month, delivered by carrier.
Address: NATIONAL REPUBLICAN,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. N. R. FUGITT is Agent for the receipt
of Advertisements and subscriptions for this
Paper, as well as for the Collection of Accounts.

All communications designed for publication
should be clearly written and only upon one side
of the paper. Communications unaccompanied by
the name of the author are not published, and will
not be returned. Accepted manuscript will not be
returned unless accompanied by a check for the
amount of the manuscript. The receipt of the
manuscript is not a receipt for the return of the
manuscript, and the return of the manuscript is
not a receipt for the return of the manuscript.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1878.

The National Republican has a larger daily
circulation than all the other morning papers
of the District combined.

HON. ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS says he
wants to die in the harness, and if his health
is spared to the end, he thinks he will do so.

There is a wide difference in the like
ness now being presented in this country
of Pope Leo XIII. If they continue to
multiply and diversify, His Holiness will be
as difficult of recognition as CHARLEY
ROSS.

If the Buffalo Courier does not readily
discover that there is very little, if any,
analogy between the State Judiciary of
Louisiana, as now conducted, and the worst
possible features that ever attached to that
of New York, no argument will reach it.
The case is iron-clad.

THE Oklahoma (Miss.) Southern States has
some convictions as to the future of certain
Southern Senators, to which it gives utterance
in this way:

"The thought that little Silver Bill
will sell Mr. BENNIE HILL,
And likewise, LEWIS C. HILL.

JAMAR states that he will resign if the Leg-
islature of his State expresses disapproval of
his action. Thereby he sets an example of
which other officials might profit.—(See
Publicist.)

Mr. LAMAR is not a man of much resig-
nation. No such worthy example will be set
by him, no matter what the Legislature of
his State may do. He will stick.

We should judge from surface indications
that the most unhappy of all people are
those quarrelsome persons who are "spoiling
for a fight," but attract no attention to their
bad spirit and worse manners. To such a
kick is a lounz and mere recognition a
treasure. When they fail to secure either,
unhappiness is their richest estate.

THE New York Commercial Advertiser
says: "Several important positions in the
War Department are held by men who en-
listered for \$14 a month, Confederate currency,
to cut throats, tear down the American flag,
and destroy the Union. These are days of
conciliation and forgiveness. They are the
corner-stones of President HAYES' adminis-
tration."

If THE "bloody shirt" that carries so
much terror into the Democratic camp is
ever buried, it will be beneath the good
faith, just deeds, law-abiding action, and a
show of becoming frankness of feeling and
conduct on the part of the Southern Demo-
crats who gave it existence. But for the
rebellion there would have been no "bloody
shirts" in the land, and when the embers of
the rebellion are fully extinguished, then
the "bloody shirt" will disappear, and not
till then.

THE St. Louis Globe-Democrat says: "One
of the most terrible tragedies which it has
been our duty to record in many months
occurred at the Lindell Hotel yesterday
morning. Two young people, entertaining
for each other a strong and pure affection,
and denied by parental interference its
natural consummation, deliberately planned
and accomplished their own destruction in
the murder of the one and the suicide of
the other. The evidence seems clear and
conclusive as to premeditation and mutual
agreement. The circumstances, taken to-
gether, make a case of tragic romance with
but few parallels in the annals of this or
any other city."

MR. ELLIS, in his speech on the ALEXAN-
DRAHILL case, said: "What he wanted
was that Louisiana should be left alone."
This sounds very familiar to the people of
the North. We heard those words in the
winter of 1860 and 1861. The South then
asked "to be left alone." Its leaders were
trying to destroy the Union, and all they
asked was "to be left alone." The people of
the United States did not see fit to comply
with this modest request, and by unparal-
leled exertions the Union was preserved.
Now that the same men, actuated by the
same devilish spirit which inspired them in
1861, are trying to undo all that was done
by the war, they once more rise in the
halls of Congress and ask "to be left alone."
The spirit of patriotism, the determination
to preserve the Government and to protect
all its people borne as brightly in the
breasts of the American people as it did in
1861, and we can tell these gentlemen that
they will not "be left alone" in their efforts
to destroy the Union and to oppress a por-
tion of its people.

Bull-Dozing.
The Mississippi courts, as they attempt
to investigate the cases of bull-dozing in
that State, soon find how difficult it is to
arrive at the real facts. The Jackson Times
gives the following as an extract from the
report of the grand jury of Louisiana County,
recently discharged:

"The grand jury have made special efforts
to investigate cases of bull-dozing and
finding which have occurred, and numerous
witnesses, parties, suspects and un-
suspected, and we can tell these gentlemen
that they will not "be left alone" in their efforts
to destroy the Union and to oppress a por-
tion of its people.

We were not long, however, in getting up
sufficient evidence to bring us to a unanimous
conclusion that each neighborhood had its
own lounz and bull-dozing, or rather the
main leaders who incited the crime did not
reside far from the place where the crimes
were committed. This conclusion exploded
the idea often repeated that the perpetrators
of these crimes were a mysterious clan of
men, who traveled from a distance on shod-

horses, and appeared and disappeared like
visions. The grand jury have grounds of suspicion
against many parties against whom they have
preferred indictments.

Where a set of men sworn together for
diabolical work, perjury stands very little in
the way of proving an *invidium* when part of
the clan get in trouble.

If the indictments brought in do not
furnish sufficient admission to parties who have
escaped to come them to doleat from their
crimes, we hope the State government will
furnish the aid of secret service to discover
the authors of past crimes, as well as those of
the future.

The Anti-Silver Mania.
The New York Tribune grows more and
more rabid as the silver measure moves
steadily forward toward a statutory pro-
vision, when it will take its place among
the laws of the land. Its ravings are pitia-
ble and its wild predictions are simply
absurd. It now speaks with great confidence
of its meeting a veto at the hands of the
President. It says: "The bill in its present
form can be interpreted and executed, as
we have shown, in entire harmony with the
constitution act. Nevertheless, it is an es-
sentially dishonest and dishonorable measure."

As a teacher of moral ethics the Tribune
has greatly weakened its forces by recom-
mending to the President, pending the
measure, that he should use the patronage
of the Government to control votes against
its passage. A journal so blind to the purity
of legislation as to openly suggest a corrupt
agency in passing laws has no clear percep-
tion of the line between right and wrong
that renders it a safe guide as a high moral
teacher as to the honesty of dishonesty of
public measures.

If the Tribune would learn that it is "hard
to kick against the pricks," and die out of
this contest with a better grace, it will
leave a more fragrant memory behind it
when this controversy is ended, as it will
be in a few days at farthest. There is no
reason why the President should veto
this measure. It is of the people and for
the people, and will become a law in spite
of the veto, should it be interposed. That
the money power desires the President to
place obstacles in the way of its consumma-
tion there is no doubt; but, as he regards
the popular will and good and his own
position in popular respect, he will not
allow himself to be used for any such
purpose. We have other and stronger reasons,
however, for a feeling of confidence that he
will not exercise the veto power in this
instance.

Partiality.
The following unique but characteristic
specimen of South Carolina justice is re-
ported among the debates in the Legisla-
ture, as given by the Columbia (S. C.) Re-
gister of February 10:

Mr. RICE insisted that the investigating
committee should be instructed to make an
early report; that they had been at work a
long time; that he wanted all the testimony
taken before published to the world; that
the Democratic party had been charged by the
Northern press with suppressing damaging
evidence which had been added against cer-
tain influential Democrats; that he was in
favor of making everything public and open-
ed to secret investigation; that it was due
to the Legislature that all the working of the
committee should be published.

Mr. HASKELL took an opposite view of the
resolution. He was opposed to publishing the
testimony against any persons save those who
had held public office; that he did not believe
in publishing the private conduct of any
individual, which would ruin the reputation of
many prominent gentlemen.

Mr. HASKELL is WADE HAMPSON's son-in-
law, and regarded as his spokesman on
the floor of the House. It is needless to
state that his view prevailed. It was left
discretionary with the committee what
they would report.

The fact is that the committee and the
Democratic party they represent are rather
awkwardly situated. They have been in-
vestigating the conduct of Republicans,
with the view of destroying the influence
of individuals and the party, but they
have found that in almost every case
they have really discovered corruption
they have found Democrats involved in
it. The committee are therefore very
desirous of exposing the Republicans, but
shielding the Democrats, and don't see how
they can ride these two horses, going in
different directions, at the same time.

Mark the solicitude of Mr. HASKELL: He
is unwilling to place "before the public gaze
slandering testimony, which would ruin the
reputation of many prominent gentlemen."
Indeed! But Mr. HASKELL is perfectly
willing that such testimony should be
placed before the world when Republican
gentlemen are concerned. In the case of
Democrats the testimony is slanderous. But
Messrs. CARPENTER, SMALLS, and CARROLL
have been convicted on just such testimony.
And the newspapers are daily furnished
with extracts of such testimony, which are
published far and wide for the purpose of
injuring the character of such prominent
Republicans who have not yet been in-
dicted.

Messrs. PATTERSON, SCOTT, HOGE, DEXS,
WHITTEMORE, GRAVES, and other Republi-
can leaders have been indicted on such
testimony. If the Democrats of South
Carolina wish to inspire confidence and re-
spect, let them publish the full report of the
committee and all of the testimony taken.
It is but *ex parte*. The public will judge
of its value by the character of the witnesses
and the circumstances under which they
testified, as well as the probability of the
truthfulness of the testimony itself. And let
the Attorney-General of the State obtain
the indictment and trial of all parties in-
respective of their political opinions, when
the testimony will warrant his proceeding
against.

GRANT, who was then at Cairo, He had
often before refused to make any statement
on this subject. "What is the use," he said
to the writer in Paris, "of pursuing a con-
troversy with gentlemen who have news-
papers at their control and dead men for
their subjects?"

Speaking of this article, which seemed to
demand notice, the General said:

It is most unjust and does not reflect credit
upon the reputation of Mr. CURTIS for honesty
and fairness. It is assumed by Mr. CURTIS
and other defenders of Mr. CURTIS that I in
some way wantonly attacked the reputation
of Mr. SCUMMER and Mr. MOTLEY. Now here
are the facts: When Mr. MOTLEY died I was
in England. Two articles came to my attention—
one from the pen of JAMES JAY, and the other
from that of Mr. SMALLEY, of the Tribune.
Both of these articles did myself, and especially
Governor FISH, great justice, saying, among
other things, that we had killed Mr. MOTLEY,
although he left his mission in 1870 and died
in 1877. Some time after I was travel-
ing from London to Edinburgh and I met
Mr. CORPUS, on the train, who was
representing the Tribune. He took occasion
to speak to me of the articles of the
Tribune, and to state the real facts as I
remembered them. The Tribune was travel-
ing about forty-five miles an hour at the time,
and no notes were taken. My statement was
written out afterward by Mr. CORPUS, and
sent to him by Mr. SCUMMER about
January 1, 1870, to read and induce him to
support the St. Domingo treaty. I never thought
of such a thing. I had no idea that the treaty
would meet with opposition from him or any
one else. I called simply out of respect to the
position Mr. SCUMMER held as the head of the
Committee on Foreign Relations, and to
explain why the fact of such a treatise some-
times negotiated should have been kept from
the public and from Congress until that time,
and to explain to him also the reports brought
back by the agents of the Government who
had visited the island as to the resources of
St. Domingo, its soil, the character of the
people, their wishes in regard to annexation,
and other things, as to whether or not
he would support the treaty was asked by
Colonel FORNEY, who happened to be present.
You see I called as Mr. SCUMMER was finish-
ing dinner, and Colonel FORNEY was one of
the guests. He left me before I entered
and I asked him to remain. When I had
finished my statement Colonel FORNEY said:
"Of course, Mr. SCUMMER, you will support
this treaty, and I will support it, and I will
remember the words. If I had any doubts as to
the course of Mr. SCUMMER in relation to this
treaty the answer would have been very satis-
fying. I am sure that you will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."

He then alluded to the violent and per-
sistent opposition of Senator EDMUNDS to
the treaty, and the long-continued friend-
ship and esteem that still exists between
that Senator and myself.

The same could be said of Mr. WILSON
and others. In reply to the suggestion that
Mr. SCUMMER had given an implied promise
to support the treaty, General GRANT said,
with some earnestness:

There is another apprehension. It is said
that I made a visit to Mr. SCUMMER about
January 1, 1870, to read and induce him to
support the St. Domingo treaty. I never thought
of such a thing. I had no idea that the treaty
would meet with opposition from him or any
one else. I called simply out of respect to the
position Mr. SCUMMER held as the head of the
Committee on Foreign Relations, and to
explain why the fact of such a treatise some-
times negotiated should have been kept from
the public and from Congress until that time,
and to explain to him also the reports brought
back by the agents of the Government who
had visited the island as to the resources of
St. Domingo, its soil, the character of the
people, their wishes in regard to annexation,
and other things, as to whether or not
he would support the treaty was asked by
Colonel FORNEY, who happened to be present.
You see I called as Mr. SCUMMER was finish-
ing dinner, and Colonel FORNEY was one of
the guests. He left me before I entered
and I asked him to remain. When I had
finished my statement Colonel FORNEY said:
"Of course, Mr. SCUMMER, you will support
this treaty, and I will support it, and I will
remember the words. If I had any doubts as to
the course of Mr. SCUMMER in relation to this
treaty the answer would have been very satis-
fying. I am sure that you will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."

He then alluded to the violent and per-
sistent opposition of Senator EDMUNDS to
the treaty, and the long-continued friend-
ship and esteem that still exists between
that Senator and myself.

The same could be said of Mr. WILSON
and others. In reply to the suggestion that
Mr. SCUMMER had given an implied promise
to support the treaty, General GRANT said,
with some earnestness:

There is another apprehension. It is said
that I made a visit to Mr. SCUMMER about
January 1, 1870, to read and induce him to
support the St. Domingo treaty. I never thought
of such a thing. I had no idea that the treaty
would meet with opposition from him or any
one else. I called simply out of respect to the
position Mr. SCUMMER held as the head of the
Committee on Foreign Relations, and to
explain why the fact of such a treatise some-
times negotiated should have been kept from
the public and from Congress until that time,
and to explain to him also the reports brought
back by the agents of the Government who
had visited the island as to the resources of
St. Domingo, its soil, the character of the
people, their wishes in regard to annexation,
and other things, as to whether or not
he would support the treaty was asked by
Colonel FORNEY, who happened to be present.
You see I called as Mr. SCUMMER was finish-
ing dinner, and Colonel FORNEY was one of
the guests. He left me before I entered
and I asked him to remain. When I had
finished my statement Colonel FORNEY said:
"Of course, Mr. SCUMMER, you will support
this treaty, and I will support it, and I will
remember the words. If I had any doubts as to
the course of Mr. SCUMMER in relation to this
treaty the answer would have been very satis-
fying. I am sure that you will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."

He then alluded to the violent and per-
sistent opposition of Senator EDMUNDS to
the treaty, and the long-continued friend-
ship and esteem that still exists between
that Senator and myself.

The same could be said of Mr. WILSON
and others. In reply to the suggestion that
Mr. SCUMMER had given an implied promise
to support the treaty, General GRANT said,
with some earnestness:

There is another apprehension. It is said
that I made a visit to Mr. SCUMMER about
January 1, 1870, to read and induce him to
support the St. Domingo treaty. I never thought
of such a thing. I had no idea that the treaty
would meet with opposition from him or any
one else. I called simply out of respect to the
position Mr. SCUMMER held as the head of the
Committee on Foreign Relations, and to
explain why the fact of such a treatise some-
times negotiated should have been kept from
the public and from Congress until that time,
and to explain to him also the reports brought
back by the agents of the Government who
had visited the island as to the resources of
St. Domingo, its soil, the character of the
people, their wishes in regard to annexation,
and other things, as to whether or not
he would support the treaty was asked by
Colonel FORNEY, who happened to be present.
You see I called as Mr. SCUMMER was finish-
ing dinner, and Colonel FORNEY was one of
the guests. He left me before I entered
and I asked him to remain. When I had
finished my statement Colonel FORNEY said:
"Of course, Mr. SCUMMER, you will support
this treaty, and I will support it, and I will
remember the words. If I had any doubts as to
the course of Mr. SCUMMER in relation to this
treaty the answer would have been very satis-
fying. I am sure that you will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."

He then alluded to the violent and per-
sistent opposition of Senator EDMUNDS to
the treaty, and the long-continued friend-
ship and esteem that still exists between
that Senator and myself.

The same could be said of Mr. WILSON
and others. In reply to the suggestion that
Mr. SCUMMER had given an implied promise
to support the treaty, General GRANT said,
with some earnestness:

There is another apprehension. It is said
that I made a visit to Mr. SCUMMER about
January 1, 1870, to read and induce him to
support the St. Domingo treaty. I never thought
of such a thing. I had no idea that the treaty
would meet with opposition from him or any
one else. I called simply out of respect to the
position Mr. SCUMMER held as the head of the
Committee on Foreign Relations, and to
explain why the fact of such a treatise some-
times negotiated should have been kept from
the public and from Congress until that time,
and to explain to him also the reports brought
back by the agents of the Government who
had visited the island as to the resources of
St. Domingo, its soil, the character of the
people, their wishes in regard to annexation,
and other things, as to whether or not
he would support the treaty was asked by
Colonel FORNEY, who happened to be present.
You see I called as Mr. SCUMMER was finish-
ing dinner, and Colonel FORNEY was one of
the guests. He left me before I entered
and I asked him to remain. When I had
finished my statement Colonel FORNEY said:
"Of course, Mr. SCUMMER, you will support
this treaty, and I will support it, and I will
remember the words. If I had any doubts as to
the course of Mr. SCUMMER in relation to this
treaty the answer would have been very satis-
fying. I am sure that you will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."

He then alluded to the violent and per-
sistent opposition of Senator EDMUNDS to
the treaty, and the long-continued friend-
ship and esteem that still exists between
that Senator and myself.

The same could be said of Mr. WILSON
and others. In reply to the suggestion that
Mr. SCUMMER had given an implied promise
to support the treaty, General GRANT said,
with some earnestness:

There is another apprehension. It is said
that I made a visit to Mr. SCUMMER about
January 1, 1870, to read and induce him to
support the St. Domingo treaty. I never thought
of such a thing. I had no idea that the treaty
would meet with opposition from him or any
one else. I called simply out of respect to the
position Mr. SCUMMER held as the head of the
Committee on Foreign Relations, and to
explain why the fact of such a treatise some-
times negotiated should have been kept from
the public and from Congress until that time,
and to explain to him also the reports brought
back by the agents of the Government who
had visited the island as to the resources of
St. Domingo, its soil, the character of the
people, their wishes in regard to annexation,
and other things, as to whether or not
he would support the treaty was asked by
Colonel FORNEY, who happened to be present.
You see I called as Mr. SCUMMER was finish-
ing dinner, and Colonel FORNEY was one of
the guests. He left me before I entered
and I asked him to remain. When I had
finished my statement Colonel FORNEY said:
"Of course, Mr. SCUMMER, you will support
this treaty, and I will support it, and I will
remember the words. If I had any doubts as to
the course of Mr. SCUMMER in relation to this
treaty the answer would have been very satis-
fying. I am sure that you will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."

for the reputation of the dead Senator, if
the General thought proper to confute their
assertions, then he is charged with slander-
ing the dead. He justly says: "If respect
is due to the dead, truth and justice are due
to the living."

Regarding the St. Domingo treaty the
General said:

It is possible that but for Mr. SCUMMER's
opposition to the St. Domingo treaty he
would never have been removed from the
chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign
Relations. But if that opposition had
anything to do with the removal of Mr.
SCUMMER and myself, the fault was
his and not mine. I made no question with
Senators who opposed him. I recognized on
that question, as I did always, that a
Senator had his independent duty and respon-
sibility, the same as an Executive.

He then alluded to the violent and per-
sistent opposition of Senator EDMUNDS to
the treaty, and the long-continued friend-
ship and esteem that still exists between
that Senator and myself.

The same could be said of Mr. WILSON
and others. In reply to the suggestion that
Mr. SCUMMER had given an implied promise
to support the treaty, General GRANT said,
with some earnestness:

There is another apprehension. It is said
that I made a visit to Mr. SCUMMER about
January 1, 1870, to read and induce him to
support the St. Domingo treaty. I never thought
of such a thing. I had no idea that the treaty
would meet with opposition from him or any
one else. I called simply out of respect to the
position Mr. SCUMMER held as the head of the
Committee on Foreign Relations, and to
explain why the fact of such a treatise some-
times negotiated should have been kept from
the public and from Congress until that time,
and to explain to him also the reports brought
back by the agents of the Government who
had visited the island as to the resources of
St. Domingo, its soil, the character of the
people, their wishes in regard to annexation,
and other things, as to whether or not
he would support the treaty was asked by
Colonel FORNEY, who happened to be present.
You see I called as Mr. SCUMMER was finish-
ing dinner, and Colonel FORNEY was one of
the guests. He left me before I entered
and I asked him to remain. When I had
finished my statement Colonel FORNEY said:
"Of course, Mr. SCUMMER, you will support
this treaty, and I will support it, and I will
remember the words. If I had any doubts as to
the course of Mr. SCUMMER in relation to this
treaty the answer would have been very satis-
fying. I am sure that you will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."

He then alluded to the violent and per-
sistent opposition of Senator EDMUNDS to
the treaty, and the long-continued friend-
ship and esteem that still exists between
that Senator and myself.

The same could be said of Mr. WILSON
and others. In reply to the suggestion that
Mr. SCUMMER had given an implied promise
to support the treaty, General GRANT said,
with some earnestness:

There is another apprehension. It is said
that I made a visit to Mr. SCUMMER about
January 1, 1870, to read and induce him to
support the St. Domingo treaty. I never thought
of such a thing. I had no idea that the treaty
would meet with opposition from him or any
one else. I called simply out of respect to the
position Mr. SCUMMER held as the head of the
Committee on Foreign Relations, and to
explain why the fact of such a treatise some-
times negotiated should have been kept from
the public and from Congress until that time,
and to explain to him also the reports brought
back by the agents of the Government who
had visited the island as to the resources of
St. Domingo, its soil, the character of the
people, their wishes in regard to annexation,
and other things, as to whether or not
he would support the treaty was asked by
Colonel FORNEY, who happened to be present.
You see I called as Mr. SCUMMER was finish-
ing dinner, and Colonel FORNEY was one of
the guests. He left me before I entered
and I asked him to remain. When I had
finished my statement Colonel FORNEY said:
"Of course, Mr. SCUMMER, you will support
this treaty, and I will support it, and I will
remember the words. If I had any doubts as to
the course of Mr. SCUMMER in relation to this
treaty the answer would have been very satis-
fying. I am sure that you will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."

He then alluded to the violent and per-
sistent opposition of Senator EDMUNDS to
the treaty, and the long-continued friend-
ship and esteem that still exists between
that Senator and myself.

The same could be said of Mr. WILSON
and others. In reply to the suggestion that
Mr. SCUMMER had given an implied promise
to support the treaty, General GRANT said,
with some earnestness:

There is another apprehension. It is said
that I made a visit to Mr. SCUMMER about
January 1, 1870, to read and induce him to
support the St. Domingo treaty. I never thought
of such a thing. I had no idea that the treaty
would meet with opposition from him or any
one else. I called simply out of respect to the
position Mr. SCUMMER held as the head of the
Committee on Foreign Relations, and to
explain why the fact of such a treatise some-
times negotiated should have been kept from
the public and from Congress until that time,
and to explain to him also the reports brought
back by the agents of the Government who
had visited the island as to the resources of
St. Domingo, its soil, the character of the
people, their wishes in regard to annexation,
and other things, as to whether or not
he would support the treaty was asked by
Colonel FORNEY, who happened to be present.
You see I called as Mr. SCUMMER was finish-
ing dinner, and Colonel FORNEY was one of
the guests. He left me before I entered
and I asked him to remain. When I had
finished my statement Colonel FORNEY said:
"Of course, Mr. SCUMMER, you will support
this treaty, and I will support it, and I will
remember the words. If I had any doubts as to
the course of Mr. SCUMMER in relation to this
treaty the answer would have been very satis-
fying. I am sure that you will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."

He then alluded to the violent and per-
sistent opposition of Senator EDMUNDS to
the treaty, and the long-continued friend-
ship and esteem that still exists between
that Senator and myself.

The same could be said of Mr. WILSON
and others. In reply to the suggestion that
Mr. SCUMMER had given an implied promise
to support the treaty, General GRANT said,
with some earnestness:

There is another apprehension. It is said
that I made a visit to Mr. SCUMMER about
January 1, 1870, to read and induce him to
support the St. Domingo treaty. I never thought
of such a thing. I had no idea that the treaty
would meet with opposition from him or any
one else. I called simply out of respect to the
position Mr. SCUMMER held as the head of the
Committee on Foreign Relations, and to
explain why the fact of such a treatise some-
times negotiated should have been kept from
the public and from Congress until that time,
and to explain to him also the reports brought
back by the agents of the Government who
had visited the island as to the resources of
St. Domingo, its soil, the character of the
people, their wishes in regard to annexation,
and other things, as to whether or not
he would support the treaty was asked by
Colonel FORNEY, who happened to be present.
You see I called as Mr. SCUMMER was finish-
ing dinner, and Colonel FORNEY was one of
the guests. He left me before I entered
and I asked him to remain. When I had
finished my statement Colonel FORNEY said:
"Of course, Mr. SCUMMER, you will support
this treaty, and I will support it, and I will
remember the words. If I had any doubts as to
the course of Mr. SCUMMER in relation to this
treaty the answer would have been very satis-
fying. I am sure that you will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."

He then alluded to the violent and per-
sistent opposition of Senator EDMUNDS to
the treaty, and the long-continued friend-
ship and esteem that still exists between
that Senator and myself.

The same could be said of Mr. WILSON
and others. In reply to the suggestion that
Mr. SCUMMER had given an implied promise
to support the treaty, General GRANT said,
with some earnestness:

There is another apprehension. It is said
that I made a visit to Mr. SCUMMER about
January 1, 1870, to read and induce him to
support the St. Domingo treaty. I never thought
of such a thing. I had no idea that the treaty
would meet with opposition from him or any
one else. I called simply out of respect to the
position Mr. SCUMMER held as the head of the
Committee on Foreign Relations, and to
explain why the fact of such a treatise some-
times negotiated should have been kept from
the public and from Congress until that time,
and to explain to him also the reports brought
back by the agents of the Government who
had visited the island as to the resources of
St. Domingo, its soil, the character of the
people, their wishes in regard to annexation,
and other things, as to whether or not
he would support the treaty was asked by
Colonel FORNEY, who happened to be present.
You see I called as Mr. SCUMMER was finish-
ing dinner, and Colonel FORNEY was one of
the guests. He left me before I entered
and I asked him to remain. When I had
finished my statement Colonel FORNEY said:
"Of course, Mr. SCUMMER, you will support
this treaty, and I will support it, and I will
remember the words. If I had any doubts as to
the course of Mr. SCUMMER in relation to this
treaty the answer would have been very satis-
fying. I am sure that you will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."
I told Mr. SCUMMER that I had finished my
statement, and he said: "I will support it."

PERSONAL.
FRANCIS D. MOUTON has denounced the re-
solutions of the English doctors in Essex from
being reported dead.

ROBERT TOMMINS is to discuss the finances in
Atlanta, Ga., on Friday evening.

FATHER SPOON, the noted Italian astronomer,
is lying at the point of death.